[3rd December 1954

*List of fire stations located outside Madras City*—cont.

| Name of the district. (1) | Names of towns where fire stations are located. (2) |
|---|---|
| 8 Malabar .. .. .. | 23 Kozhikode. |
| | 24 Cannanore. |
| | 25 Fort Cochin. |
| | 26 Palghat. |
| | 27 Tellicherry. |
| 9 The Nilgiris .. .. | 28 Coonoor. |
| | 29 Ootacamund. |
| 10 Salem .. .. .. | 30 Salem. |
| 11 South Kanara .. .. | 31 Mangalore. |
| | 32 Udipi. |
| 12 Tiruchirappalli .. .. | 33 Karur. |
| | 34 Tiruchirappalli. |
| 13 Chingleput .. .. | 35 Chingleput. |
| | 36 Kancheepuram. |
| 14 North Arcot .. .. | 37 Arkonam. |
| | 38 Gudiyatham. |
| | 39 Ranipet. |
| | 40 Tiruvannamalai. |
| | 41 Vellore. |
| | 42 Tirupattur. |

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

## Appendix III.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 30 asked by Sri A. Ratnam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 3rd December 1954, page 39 supra.]

The reasons for not referring the disputes regarding the hotel workers in the City of Madras for adjudication are given below :—

(1) *Ambi's Cafe, Madras.*—Since the management was reported to have observed the procedure of framing charges and constituting an enquiry before dismissing the workers concerned, the Government considered there was no case for adjudication.

(2) *Sri Krishna Lunch Home, Madras.*—Since the Management framed definite charges against the worker Sri Nataraja Iyer and obtained his explanation before dismissing him, the Government considered that there was no case for adjudication.

(3) *Sridhar Bhavan.*—It was reported that the worker concerned left the hotel abruptly without finishing his work and thereby acted in an irresponsible manner. The Government, therefore, considered that there was no case for intervention.

3rd December 1954]

(4) *Golden Cafe.*—One of the workers was found unfit to the post to which he was appointed. In the case of the other worker, he was reported to have disobeyed the orders of the Proprietor. The Government, therefore, considered that there was no case for adjudication.

(5) *Modern Cafe.*—The Government saw no justification to interfere in the matter as the worker's behaviour had not been good.

(6) *National Bakery and Restaurant.*—Specific charges were framed against the worker and a chance was given to him to defend himself. The Government, therefore, did not interfere in the matter.

(7) *Lalitha Lunch Home.*—In view of the considerable fall in the business and profits, the Government considered that there was no case for intervention.

(8) *New Roxy Cafe.*—The Government considered that the retrenchment was justified in view of the fall in the business of the hotel. Proper notice also was given to the workers concerned. The case was not, therefore, referred for adjudication.

(9) *Sri Rama Bhavan.*—After verification of the relevant records of the hotel, it was reported that the retrenchment of the workers was in order and justified. The Government, therefore, did not refer the dispute for adjudication.

(10) *Sri Rama Vilas Military Hotel, Kodambakkam.*—As it was reported that the workers misbehaved by causing nuisance and loss to the management, the Government considered that there was no case for adjudication.

(11) *Ratna Cafe, Triplicane.*—The Government were of the view that the strike by the workers in January 1953 was unjust. Further, the management was willing to pay 10 days' wages as additional ex-gratia payment over and above what was already promised by them. The management was also willing to pay the dismissed workers 15 days' wages in lieu of notice if they had completed six months service and 10 days' wages for each year of their service. The case was not, therefore, referred for adjudication.

(12) *Sri Udipi Krishna Vilas.*—The Government considered that the discharge of K. V. Kundanthaya and Vikram was reasonable for the reasons that the former was absent for more than four months while the latter made illegal collection from the co-workers.

(13) *My Coffee Bar.*—Since the conditions of employment of the workers in the hotel compared favourably with similar establishment and since the Association was not supported by the majority of the workers, the Government did not refer the dispute for adjudication.

[3rd December 1954

(14) *Lakshmi Cafe, Pallavaram.*—The Government considered that there was no case for intervention as the workers staged a stay-in-strike on 12th July 1953 without justification and as they picketed the hotel from 17th July 1953.

(15) *New Mani's Lunch Home, Tiruvottiyur.*—The Government did not refer the dispute for adjudication as it was reported that the worker concerned under-charged a customer thereby acting against the interests of the hotel and that when questioned, he stopped away from work.

(16) *Neo Nagar Cafe, Thyagarayanagar.*—Two of the workers were retrenched as a measure of economy. Of the two workers dismissed, worker Balakrishnan was reported to have conducted himself in an irresponsible manner. The other worker Gopal Rao was caught supplying breakfast to an expelled worker without the knowledge of the management. The Government, therefore, considered that there was no case for adjudication.

(17) *Lakshmi Vilas, Madras.*—Though the dispute in this hotel was referred for adjudication, the order was quashed on a Writ Petition filed by the management.

(18) *Udipi Sri Kamatshi Bhavan.*
(19) *Egmore Cafe, Madras.*
(20) *Ganapathi Vilas, Madras.*
(21) *Krishna Bhavan, Madras.*
(22) *Modern Hotel, Madras.*

} **The disputes in these hotels were settled by drawing up memoranda of settlement.**

## APPENDIX IV.

**[*Vide* answer to clauses (*b*) and (*c*) of unstarred question No. 1 asked by Sri A. Ratnam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 3rd December 1954, page 40 supra.]**

| *Management.* | *Elementary schools.* | *High schools.* | *Training schools.* | *Basic schools.* | *College.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| **Government** .. | **5** | **2** | **3 (1 ordinary school and 2 Basic Training Schools).** | **1** | .. |
| **Harijan Welfare Department.** | **166** | **2** | .. | **7** | .. |
| **District Boards** .. | **826** | **17** | .. | **46** | .. |
| **Municipalities** .. | **45** | **2** | .. | **13** | .. |
| **Panchayat** .. | **40** | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| **Aided** .. .. | **692** | **16** | **4** | **42** | **1 (Annamalai University).** |
| **Unaided** .. .. | **4** | .. | .. | .. | .. |